

Fiscal Note 2009 Biennium

	•				
Bill #	HB0422			e requirements for probati ense reinstatement	onary driver's license
Primary Sponsor: Cohenour, Jill			Status: As In	troduced	
☐ Significant	Local Gov Impact	☐ Needs to be include	ded in HB 2	☐ Technical Concerns	
☐ Included in	☐ Included in the Executive Budget ☐ Significant Long-Term Impacts ☐ Ded			☐ Dedicated Revenue I	Form Attached
Expenditures:		FISCAL ST FY 2008 <u>Difference</u>	UMMARY FY 2009 <u>Difference</u>	FY 2010 <u>Difference</u>	FY 2011 <u>Difference</u>
General Fund		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State Special Revenue		\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0
State Special K	evenue	ΨΟ	Ψ0	ΨΟ	ΨΟ
Revenue:					
General Fund		\$300	\$300	\$300	\$300
State Special R	evenue	\$300	\$300	\$300	\$300

Description of Fiscal Impact:

Net Impact-General Fund Balance

This bill mandates a driver rehabilitation program for an individual whose driver's license or driving privilege was suspended or revoked. The revenue generated by this bill would be split between the general fund and Highway State Special Revenue Account in the Department of Transportation.

\$300

\$300

\$300

FISCAL ANALYSIS

Assumptions:

Department of Justice & Department of Transportation

- 1. 61-5-219, MCA, currently allows a person elect to participate in an approved driver rehabilitation program. Upon submission of a certificate of completion of the approved driver rehabilitation program, the person would qualify for a 50 percent reduction in their driver's license reinstatement fee.
- 2. FY 2006 statistics indicate there were 6 individuals who completed the driver rehabilitation program and received a 50 percent reduction in their driver's license reinstatement fee (a reduction from \$200 to \$100).
- 3. Effective October 1, 2007, passage of this proposed bill will require successful completion of an approved driver rehabilitation program for an individual to be eligible for reinstatement of their driver's license.

\$300

- 4. Elimination of the 50 percent reinstatement fee discount would increase annual revenues \$300 for general fund and \$300 for state special revenue.
- 5. Any workload effort generated by the passage of this bill could be absorbed into the existing resources by adjusting the priorities in daily work planning.

	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011			
	Difference	Difference	Difference	Difference			
Fiscal Impact:							
Funding of Expenditures:							
General Fund (01)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
State Special Revenue (02)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
Revenues:							
General Fund (01)	\$300	\$300	\$300	\$300			
State Special Revenue (02)	\$300	\$300	\$300	\$300			
TOTAL Revenues	\$600	\$600	\$600	\$600			
Net Impact to Fund Balance (Revenue minus Funding of Expenditures):							
General Fund (01)	\$300	\$300	\$300	\$300			
State Special Revenue (02)	\$300	\$300	\$300	\$300			

Technical Notes:

- 1. Drivers refusing alcohol breath tests are not initially processed by a court law enforcement request only. It is not clear how a driver will be referred to traffic school and how the new requirements will interact with the existing right to appeal to District Court (61-5-211, MCA) and a resulting stay of suspension.
- 2. For DUI/BAC offenders, it is unclear how existing court referrals for substance abuse assessment course treatment requirements (61-8-732, MCA) will interact with new traffic school / defensive driving requirements.
- 3. Some offenders suspended or revoked under 61-5-205, MCA, are revoked for non-traffic offenses.

Sponsor's Initials	Date	Budget Director's Initials	Date